

**REDACTED VERSION OF SEALED DOCUMENT**

1 Kathleen Sullivan (SBN 242261)  
 2 kathleensullivan@quinnmanuel.com  
 2 QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART &  
 3 SULLIVAN LLP  
 3 51 Madison Avenue, 22<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
 4 New York, NY 10010  
 4 Telephone: (212) 849-7000  
 5 Facsimile: (212) 849-7100

5 Sean S. Pak (SBN 219032)  
 6 seanpak@quinnmanuel.com  
 7 John M. Neukom (SBN 275887)  
 7 johnneukom@quinnmanuel.com.  
 8 QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART &  
 8 SULLIVAN LLP  
 9 50 California Street, 22<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
 9 San Francisco, CA 94111  
 10 Telephone: (415) 875-6600  
 10 Facsimile: (415) 875-6700

11 Mark Tung (SBN 245782)  
 12 marktung@quinnmanuel.com  
 12 QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART &  
 13 SULLIVAN LLP  
 13 555 Twin Dolphin Drive, 5<sup>th</sup> Floor  
 14 Redwood Shores, CA 94065  
 14 Telephone: (650) 801-5000  
 15 Facsimile: (650) 801-5100

16 *Attorneys for Plaintiff Cisco Systems, Inc.*

17  
 18 Steven Cherny (*admitted pro hac vice*)  
 19 steven.cherny@kirkland.com  
 20 KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP  
 21 601 Lexington Avenue  
 22 New York, New York 10022  
 23 Telephone: (212) 446-4800  
 24 Facsimile: (212) 446-4900

25 Adam R. Alper (SBN 196834)  
 26 adam.alper@kirkland.com  
 27 KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP  
 28 555 California Street  
 29 San Francisco, California 94104  
 30 Telephone: (415) 439-1400  
 31 Facsimile: (415) 439-1500

32 Michael W. De Vries (SBN 211001)  
 33 michael.devries@kirkland.com  
 34 KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP  
 35 333 South Hope Street  
 36 Los Angeles, California 90071  
 37 Telephone: (213) 680-8400  
 38 Facsimile: (213) 680-8500

39  
 40  
 41  
 42  
 43  
 44  
 45  
 46  
 47  
 48  
 49  
 50  
 51  
 52  
 53  
 54  
 55  
 56  
 57  
 58  
 59  
 60  
 61  
 62  
 63  
 64  
 65  
 66  
 67  
 68  
 69  
 70  
 71  
 72  
 73  
 74  
 75  
 76  
 77  
 78  
 79  
 80  
 81  
 82  
 83  
 84  
 85  
 86  
 87  
 88  
 89  
 90  
 91  
 92  
 93  
 94  
 95  
 96  
 97  
 98  
 99  
 100  
 101  
 102  
 103  
 104  
 105  
 106  
 107  
 108  
 109  
 110  
 111  
 112  
 113  
 114  
 115  
 116  
 117  
 118  
 119  
 120  
 121  
 122  
 123  
 124  
 125  
 126  
 127  
 128  
 129  
 130  
 131  
 132  
 133  
 134  
 135  
 136  
 137  
 138  
 139  
 140  
 141  
 142  
 143  
 144  
 145  
 146  
 147  
 148  
 149  
 150  
 151  
 152  
 153  
 154  
 155  
 156  
 157  
 158  
 159  
 160  
 161  
 162  
 163  
 164  
 165  
 166  
 167  
 168  
 169  
 170  
 171  
 172  
 173  
 174  
 175  
 176  
 177  
 178  
 179  
 180  
 181  
 182  
 183  
 184  
 185  
 186  
 187  
 188  
 189  
 190  
 191  
 192  
 193  
 194  
 195  
 196  
 197  
 198  
 199  
 200  
 201  
 202  
 203  
 204  
 205  
 206  
 207  
 208  
 209  
 210  
 211  
 212  
 213  
 214  
 215  
 216  
 217  
 218  
 219  
 220  
 221  
 222  
 223  
 224  
 225  
 226  
 227  
 228  
 229  
 230  
 231  
 232  
 233  
 234  
 235  
 236  
 237  
 238  
 239  
 240  
 241  
 242  
 243  
 244  
 245  
 246  
 247  
 248  
 249  
 250  
 251  
 252  
 253  
 254  
 255  
 256  
 257  
 258  
 259  
 260  
 261  
 262  
 263  
 264  
 265  
 266  
 267  
 268  
 269  
 270  
 271  
 272  
 273  
 274  
 275  
 276  
 277  
 278  
 279  
 280  
 281  
 282  
 283  
 284  
 285  
 286  
 287  
 288  
 289  
 290  
 291  
 292  
 293  
 294  
 295  
 296  
 297  
 298  
 299  
 300  
 301  
 302  
 303  
 304  
 305  
 306  
 307  
 308  
 309  
 310  
 311  
 312  
 313  
 314  
 315  
 316  
 317  
 318  
 319  
 320  
 321  
 322  
 323  
 324  
 325  
 326  
 327  
 328  
 329  
 330  
 331  
 332  
 333  
 334  
 335  
 336  
 337  
 338  
 339  
 340  
 341  
 342  
 343  
 344  
 345  
 346  
 347  
 348  
 349  
 350  
 351  
 352  
 353  
 354  
 355  
 356  
 357  
 358  
 359  
 360  
 361  
 362  
 363  
 364  
 365  
 366  
 367  
 368  
 369  
 370  
 371  
 372  
 373  
 374  
 375  
 376  
 377  
 378  
 379  
 380  
 381  
 382  
 383  
 384  
 385  
 386  
 387  
 388  
 389  
 390  
 391  
 392  
 393  
 394  
 395  
 396  
 397  
 398  
 399  
 400  
 401  
 402  
 403  
 404  
 405  
 406  
 407  
 408  
 409  
 410  
 411  
 412  
 413  
 414  
 415  
 416  
 417  
 418  
 419  
 420  
 421  
 422  
 423  
 424  
 425  
 426  
 427  
 428  
 429  
 430  
 431  
 432  
 433  
 434  
 435  
 436  
 437  
 438  
 439  
 440  
 441  
 442  
 443  
 444  
 445  
 446  
 447  
 448  
 449  
 450  
 451  
 452  
 453  
 454  
 455  
 456  
 457  
 458  
 459  
 460  
 461  
 462  
 463  
 464  
 465  
 466  
 467  
 468  
 469  
 470  
 471  
 472  
 473  
 474  
 475  
 476  
 477  
 478  
 479  
 480  
 481  
 482  
 483  
 484  
 485  
 486  
 487  
 488  
 489  
 490  
 491  
 492  
 493  
 494  
 495  
 496  
 497  
 498  
 499  
 500  
 501  
 502  
 503  
 504  
 505  
 506  
 507  
 508  
 509  
 510  
 511  
 512  
 513  
 514  
 515  
 516  
 517  
 518  
 519  
 520  
 521  
 522  
 523  
 524  
 525  
 526  
 527  
 528  
 529  
 530  
 531  
 532  
 533  
 534  
 535  
 536  
 537  
 538  
 539  
 540  
 541  
 542  
 543  
 544  
 545  
 546  
 547  
 548  
 549  
 550  
 551  
 552  
 553  
 554  
 555  
 556  
 557  
 558  
 559  
 560  
 561  
 562  
 563  
 564  
 565  
 566  
 567  
 568  
 569  
 570  
 571  
 572  
 573  
 574  
 575  
 576  
 577  
 578  
 579  
 580  
 581  
 582  
 583  
 584  
 585  
 586  
 587  
 588  
 589  
 590  
 591  
 592  
 593  
 594  
 595  
 596  
 597  
 598  
 599  
 600  
 601  
 602  
 603  
 604  
 605  
 606  
 607  
 608  
 609  
 610  
 611  
 612  
 613  
 614  
 615  
 616  
 617  
 618  
 619  
 620  
 621  
 622  
 623  
 624  
 625  
 626  
 627  
 628  
 629  
 630  
 631  
 632  
 633  
 634  
 635  
 636  
 637  
 638  
 639  
 640  
 641  
 642  
 643  
 644  
 645  
 646  
 647  
 648  
 649  
 650  
 651  
 652  
 653  
 654  
 655  
 656  
 657  
 658  
 659  
 660  
 661  
 662  
 663  
 664  
 665  
 666  
 667  
 668  
 669  
 670  
 671  
 672  
 673  
 674  
 675  
 676  
 677  
 678  
 679  
 680  
 681  
 682  
 683  
 684  
 685  
 686  
 687  
 688  
 689  
 690  
 691  
 692  
 693  
 694  
 695  
 696  
 697  
 698  
 699  
 700  
 701  
 702  
 703  
 704  
 705  
 706  
 707  
 708  
 709  
 710  
 711  
 712  
 713  
 714  
 715  
 716  
 717  
 718  
 719  
 720  
 721  
 722  
 723  
 724  
 725  
 726  
 727  
 728  
 729  
 730  
 731  
 732  
 733  
 734  
 735  
 736  
 737  
 738  
 739  
 740  
 741  
 742  
 743  
 744  
 745  
 746  
 747  
 748  
 749  
 750  
 751  
 752  
 753  
 754  
 755  
 756  
 757  
 758  
 759  
 760  
 761  
 762  
 763  
 764  
 765  
 766  
 767  
 768  
 769  
 770  
 771  
 772  
 773  
 774  
 775  
 776  
 777  
 778  
 779  
 780  
 781  
 782  
 783  
 784  
 785  
 786  
 787  
 788  
 789  
 790  
 791  
 792  
 793  
 794  
 795  
 796  
 797  
 798  
 799  
 800  
 801  
 802  
 803  
 804  
 805  
 806  
 807  
 808  
 809  
 810  
 811  
 812  
 813  
 814  
 815  
 816  
 817  
 818  
 819  
 820  
 821  
 822  
 823  
 824  
 825  
 826  
 827  
 828  
 829  
 830  
 831  
 832  
 833  
 834  
 835  
 836  
 837  
 838  
 839  
 840  
 841  
 842  
 843  
 844  
 845  
 846  
 847  
 848  
 849  
 850  
 851  
 852  
 853  
 854  
 855  
 856  
 857  
 858  
 859  
 860  
 861  
 862  
 863  
 864  
 865  
 866  
 867  
 868  
 869  
 870  
 871  
 872  
 873  
 874  
 875  
 876  
 877  
 878  
 879  
 880  
 881  
 882  
 883  
 884  
 885  
 886  
 887  
 888  
 889  
 890  
 891  
 892  
 893  
 894  
 895  
 896  
 897  
 898  
 899  
 900  
 901  
 902  
 903  
 904  
 905  
 906  
 907  
 908  
 909  
 910  
 911  
 912  
 913  
 914  
 915  
 916  
 917  
 918  
 919  
 920  
 921  
 922  
 923  
 924  
 925  
 926  
 927  
 928  
 929  
 930  
 931  
 932  
 933  
 934  
 935  
 936  
 937  
 938  
 939  
 940  
 941  
 942  
 943  
 944  
 945  
 946  
 947  
 948  
 949  
 950  
 951  
 952  
 953  
 954  
 955  
 956  
 957  
 958  
 959  
 960  
 961  
 962  
 963  
 964  
 965  
 966  
 967  
 968  
 969  
 970  
 971  
 972  
 973  
 974  
 975  
 976  
 977  
 978  
 979  
 980  
 981  
 982  
 983  
 984  
 985  
 986  
 987  
 988  
 989  
 990  
 991  
 992  
 993  
 994  
 995  
 996  
 997  
 998  
 999  
 1000  
 1001  
 1002  
 1003  
 1004  
 1005  
 1006  
 1007  
 1008  
 1009  
 1010  
 1011  
 1012  
 1013  
 1014  
 1015  
 1016  
 1017  
 1018  
 1019  
 1020  
 1021  
 1022  
 1023  
 1024  
 1025  
 1026  
 1027  
 1028  
 1029  
 1030  
 1031  
 1032  
 1033  
 1034  
 1035  
 1036  
 1037  
 1038  
 1039  
 1040  
 1041  
 1042  
 1043  
 1044  
 1045  
 1046  
 1047  
 1048  
 1049  
 1050  
 1051  
 1052  
 1053  
 1054  
 1055  
 1056  
 1057  
 1058  
 1059  
 1060  
 1061  
 1062  
 1063  
 1064  
 1065  
 1066  
 1067  
 1068  
 1069  
 1070  
 1071  
 1072  
 1073  
 1074  
 1075  
 1076  
 1077  
 1078  
 1079  
 1080  
 1081  
 1082  
 1083  
 1084  
 1085  
 1086  
 1087  
 1088  
 1089  
 1090  
 1091  
 1092  
 1093  
 1094  
 1095  
 1096  
 1097  
 1098  
 1099  
 1100  
 1101  
 1102  
 1103  
 1104  
 1105  
 1106  
 1107  
 1108  
 1109  
 1110  
 1111  
 1112  
 1113  
 1114  
 1115  
 1116  
 1117  
 1118  
 1119  
 1120  
 1121  
 1122  
 1123  
 1124  
 1125  
 1126  
 1127  
 1128  
 1129  
 1130  
 1131  
 1132  
 1133  
 1134  
 1135  
 1136  
 1137  
 1138  
 1139  
 1140  
 1141  
 1142  
 1143  
 1144  
 1145  
 1146  
 1147  
 1148  
 1149  
 1150  
 1151  
 1152  
 1153  
 1154  
 1155  
 1156  
 1157  
 1158  
 1159  
 1160  
 1161  
 1162  
 1163  
 1164  
 1165  
 1166  
 1167  
 1168  
 1169  
 1170  
 1171  
 1172  
 1173  
 1174  
 1175  
 1176  
 1177  
 1178  
 1179  
 1180  
 1181  
 1182  
 1183  
 1184  
 1185  
 1186  
 1187  
 1188  
 1189  
 1190  
 1191  
 1192  
 1193  
 1194  
 1195  
 1196  
 1197  
 1198  
 1199  
 1200  
 1201  
 1202  
 1203  
 1204  
 1205  
 1206  
 1207  
 1208  
 1209  
 1210  
 1211  
 1212  
 1213  
 1214  
 1215  
 1216  
 1217  
 1218  
 1219  
 1220  
 1221  
 1222  
 1223  
 1224  
 1225  
 1226  
 1227  
 1228  
 1229  
 1230  
 1231  
 1232  
 1233  
 1234  
 1235  
 1236  
 1237  
 1238  
 1239  
 1240  
 1241  
 1242  
 1243  
 1244  
 1245  
 1246  
 1247  
 1248  
 1249  
 1250  
 1251  
 1252  
 1253  
 1254  
 1255  
 1256  
 1257  
 1258  
 1259  
 1260  
 1261  
 1262  
 1263  
 1264  
 1265  
 1266  
 1267  
 1268  
 1269  
 1270  
 1271  
 1272  
 1273  
 1274  
 1275  
 1276  
 1277  
 1278  
 1279  
 1280  
 1281  
 1282  
 1283  
 1284  
 1285  
 1286  
 1287  
 1288  
 1289  
 1290  
 1291  
 1292  
 1293  
 1294  
 1295  
 1296  
 1297  
 1298  
 1299  
 1300  
 1301  
 1302  
 1303  
 1304  
 1305  
 1306  
 1307  
 1308  
 1309  
 1310  
 1311  
 1312  
 1313  
 1314  
 1315  
 1316  
 1317  
 1318  
 1319  
 1320  
 1321  
 1322  
 1323  
 1324  
 1325  
 1326  
 1327  
 1328  
 1329  
 1330  
 1331  
 1332  
 1333  
 1334  
 1335  
 1336  
 1337  
 1338  
 1339  
 1340  
 1341  
 1342  
 1343  
 1344  
 1345  
 1346  
 1347  
 1348  
 1349  
 1350  
 1351  
 1352  
 1353  
 1354  
 1355  
 1356  
 1357  
 1358  
 1359  
 1360  
 1361  
 1362  
 1363  
 1364  
 1365  
 1366  
 1367  
 1368  
 1369  
 1370  
 1371  
 1372  
 1373  
 1374  
 1375  
 1376  
 1377  
 1378  
 1379  
 1380  
 1381  
 1382  
 1383  
 1384  
 1385  
 1386  
 1387  
 1388  
 1389  
 1390  
 1391  
 1392  
 1393  
 1394  
 1395  
 1396  
 1397  
 1398  
 1399  
 1400  
 1401  
 1402  
 1403  
 1404  
 1405  
 1406  
 1407  
 1408  
 1409  
 1410  
 1411  
 1412  
 1413  
 1414  
 1415  
 1416  
 1417  
 1418  
 1419  
 1420  
 1421  
 1422  
 1423  
 1424  
 1425  
 1426  
 1427  
 1428  
 1429  
 1430  
 1431  
 1432  
 1433  
 1434  
 1435  
 1436  
 14

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

2	I.	Introduction and Summary of Argument .....	1
3	II.	Factual Background.....	2
4	A.	Cisco’s Development of Its Copyrighted Works .....	2
5	B.	Arista’s Decision to Copy Cisco’s CLI.....	3
6	C.	Cisco Files Suit to Protect Its Intellectual Property .....	4
7	D.	Arista’s One-Sided Approach to Discovery in this Case .....	5
8	E.	Arista’s Failure to Meet and Confer.....	7
9	F.	Cisco’s Supplemental Response to Interrogatory No. 16.....	10
10	III.	Legal Standard.....	10
11	IV.	Argument.....	11
12	A.	Cisco Has Already Produced Extensive Information About Its Copyrighted CLI .....	11
13	B.	The Remaining Incremental Information Arista Seeks Is Not Relevant.....	14
14	C.	The Burden of Obtaining this Incremental Information Would Be Disproportionate to Its Relevance .....	17
15	D.	Arista’s Motion to Compel Is Procedurally Improper .....	19
16	V.	Conclusion.....	20

## **TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

Page

Cases

16	<i>Casa Duse, LLC v. Merkin</i> , 791 F.3d 247 (2d Cir. 2015) .....	13
5	<i>Amer. Dental Assoc. v. Delta Dental Plans Assoc.</i> , 126 F.3d 977 (7th Cir. 1997) .....	13
7	<i>Brocade Communications Sys., Inc. v. A10 Networks, Inc.</i> , 2013 WL 831528 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 10, 2013) .....	16
8	<i>Feist Publications, Inc. v. Rural Telephone Service Co.</i> , 499 U.S. 340 (1991) .....	15
10	<i>In re First Franklin Financial Corp. Lit.</i> , 2010 WL 961649 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 16, 2010) .....	11, 20
11	<i>Louisiana Pac. Corp. v. Money Mkt. I Institutional Inv. Dealer</i> , 2012 WL 5519199 (Nov. 14, 2012) .....	10
13	<i>Secureinfo Corp. v. Telos Corp.</i> , 387 F. Supp. 2d 593 (E.D. Va. Sep. 9, 2005) .....	16
14		

Statutes

16	17 U.S.C. § 201(b) .....	13
17	17 U.S.C. § 410(c) .....	15
18	Civil L.R. 37-1(a) .....	11, 19
19	Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(b) .....	10
20	Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(b)(2)(B) .....	11
21	Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(b)(2)(C)(iii) .....	11
22	Fed. R. Civ. P. 33(d) .....	8, 9, 12
23	Fed. R. Civ. P. 37(a)(1) .....	11, 19

**REDACTED VERSION OF SEALED DOCUMENT****I. INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT**

1 Plaintiff Cisco Systems, Inc. (“Cisco”) opposes the Motion to Compel Interrogatory  
2 Responses (“Motion”) (Dkt. 66) filed on September 17, 2015 by Defendant Arista Networks, Inc.  
3 (“Arista”). Arista’s motion seeks an order compelling Cisco to produce thousands of individual  
4 data points across hundreds of individual elements (each taken out of context) from Cisco’s  
5 copyrighted works-in-suit that Arista has intentionally copied into its accused products. Arista’s  
6 motion should be denied for many reasons, the most prominent being that Cisco has in fact  
7 ***provided*** responsive data. *See* Ex. 1.<sup>1</sup> Instead of reviewing the information Cisco had already  
8 produced, or negotiating with Cisco concerning a reasonable scope for a supplemental production,  
9 Arista raced to the courthouse to file an improper motion to compel voluminous additional data  
10 points that are irrelevant to the real issues in this case.

12 This case is about Arista’s intentional infringement of Cisco’s copyrighted operating  
13 systems. To avoid having to expend the resources necessary to create an original command-line  
14 interface, Arista deliberately chose to copy—wholesale—the command-line interface (“CLI”)  
15 from Cisco’s copyrighted works-in-suit, as well as other related material. The material Arista  
16 copied includes hundreds of original multi-word command expressions, the creative way in which  
17 Cisco arranged those expressions, Cisco’s command modes and prompts, Cisco’s chosen  
18 expressions for command outputs, and the documentation Cisco authored to explain its  
19 copyrighted works. Arista copied so much it even copied typographical errors Cisco had  
20 regrettably made. Arista should not be permitted to evade liability for its intentional infringement  
21 of Cisco’s copyrighted works by shifting the focus from its intentional and wide-ranging  
22 infringement to minutiae about the development of the individual elements of Cisco works that  
23 Arista copied.

24 That Arista’s motion to compel is more tactical gambit than genuine desire for relevant  
25 information is evident from the manner in which Arista pursued the issue. Arista moved to  
26 \_\_\_\_\_

27 <sup>1</sup> Citations to “Ex. \_\_” refer to exhibits to the Declaration of Matthew D. Cannon, filed  
28 herewith.

1 compel without (1) completing the meet-and-confer process; (2) engaging in even a discussion of  
 2 the heavy burden (and meager relevance) of its interrogatory requests; (3) addressing Cisco's  
 3 numerosity objection—that a single interrogatory purporting to request thousands of data points  
 4 across five categories of information for hundreds of "command" entries is improper on its face;  
 5 or (4) permitting Cisco an opportunity to supplement to address Arista's concerns first articulated  
 6 in what was purportedly a "meet and confer" session. Cisco has promptly supplemented, as it  
 7 promised it would when the parties spoke, rendering Arista's motion largely moot. Arista's  
 8 Motion to Compel therefore should be denied.

9 **II. FACTUAL BACKGROUND**

10 **A. Cisco's Development of Its Copyrighted Works**

11 Nearly thirty years ago, Cisco created a new way for users to interact with Cisco's network  
 12 routing and switching products. Instead of remotely uploading standard configuration files, Cisco  
 13 engineers conceived of a unique CLI that permitted users to log onto a router or switch and  
 14 configure it directly. This new concept for interaction between network engineers and the devices  
 15 on which they worked afforded Cisco an opportunity for great creativity. Embarking on that  
 16 opportunity to create new works made for hire, Cisco's engineers created an elaborate  
 17 arrangement of original command expressions, including the multi-word command expressions at  
 18 issue here, that could be entered into the CLI. In addition, Cisco created new command modes  
 19 and prompts, command outputs, and supporting documents. These aspects of Cisco's copyrighted  
 20 operating systems proved extremely popular with Cisco's customers.

21 Over the thirty years that Cisco's products have run its original operating system, including  
 22 the CLI that Cisco developed, Cisco's engineers have continued to generate new elements,  
 23 including command expressions. Cisco has released dozens of versions of its operating systems  
 24 incorporating these elements. *See, e.g.*, Dkt. 64 ¶ 25 (identifying copyrighted operating systems).  
 25 Throughout this development process, Cisco's engineers made creative choices about how  
 26 command expressions would be arranged and the syntax those command expressions would  
 27 employ. Cisco's unique and copyrighted CLI—including the original set of command expressions  
 28 created by Cisco—became extremely popular with Cisco's customers. That is why Arista, by its

1 own admission earlier this month, “emulates Cisco’s command line interface”—to take advantage  
 2 of the popularity of the CLI that Cisco created. *See* Ex. 2 at 54:25-55:2.

3 **B. Arista’s Decision to Copy Cisco’s CLI**

4 Arista was formed by a handful of former Cisco executives wishing to compete with Cisco.  
 5 Because there are many successful companies that have been started by former Cisco people, and  
 6 because Cisco strongly supports employee mobility, the fact that Arista competed with Cisco was  
 7 hardly controversial. However, shortly before this suit began, Arista’s most senior executive  
 8 began making a series of troubling public statements suggesting that Arista had deliberately  
 9 copied Cisco’s innovations to compete unfairly. This prompted an investigation by Cisco that  
 10 revealed widespread intellectual property infringement and caused Cisco to initiate litigation  
 11 against Arista. Cisco rarely does this; before this lawsuit, Cisco had not sued a competitor for  
 12 intellectual property theft for approximately ten years.

13 This case and motion relate to Arista’s decision to deliberately copy Cisco’s user interface  
 14 and place it on Arista’s networking switches because, according to Arista’s own CTO, former  
 15 Cisco employee Ken Duda, customers apparently do not like the Linux user interface Arista now  
 16 supplies. Customers instead prefer Cisco’s CLI that Arista copied into Arista’s switches. By  
 17 taking these shortcuts, Arista competes against Cisco without investing in engineers and  
 18 innovation the way Cisco has since it was first formed. As Arista CEO Jayshree Ullal explained  
 19 in 2013:

20 The training [on how to use Arista’s EOS operating system] is very easy and a  
 21 Cisco CCIE expert would be able to use Arista right away, ***because we have  
 22 similar command-line interfaces and operational look and feel.*** Where we don’t  
 23 have to invent, we don’t.

24 Ex. 3 at CSI-ANI-00381281 (emphasis added).

25 While Arista’s public statements thus indicated its desire to duplicate Cisco’s original CLI,  
 26 the documents Arista eventually produced in discovery now reveal that copying Cisco’s CLI is a  
 27 core part of Arista’s internal strategy. A 2006 email to Arista’s internal engineering email list  
 28 reported that [REDACTED]  
 [REDACTED]

1 [REDACTED]  
 2 [REDACTED]  
 3 [REDACTED]  
 4 [REDACTED]  
 5 [REDACTED]  
 6 [REDACTED]  
 7 [REDACTED]

8 From the very beginning, then, Arista sought to copy Cisco's CLI. The only question that  
 9 Arista debated was how "slavishly" to do so. *See* Ex. 5 at ANI-ITC-944\_945-3599339. For  
 10 example, in a 2009 email chain, an Arista employee reported that customers insist that Arista  
 11 [REDACTED]

12 Certain customers had reported to Arista that [REDACTED]  
 13 [REDACTED] In response, Arista CEO Jayshree Ullal confirmed what she would only much later  
 14 state publicly: that it is [REDACTED] and Arista should instead  
 15 [REDACTED]  
 16 [REDACTED]

17 Eventually, Arista did get around to developing its own Linux-based user interface (against  
 18 which Cisco has brought no copyright claims in this case). But by Arista's own admission, it is  
 19 the Cisco CLI that Arista copied—not Arista's Linux-based CLI—that Arista's customers prefer.  
 20 At least 80% of Arista's customers have indicated to Arista that "they appreciate the way they can  
 21 leverage their deep [Cisco] IOS experience, as they can easily upgrade an aging [Cisco] Catalyst  
 22 infrastructure to Arista." Ex. 7. Arista's explicit strategy was to migrate the vast majority of  
 23 Arista's customers from Cisco by intentionally copying Cisco's CLI.

24 **C. Cisco Files Suit to Protect Its Intellectual Property**

25 As explained above, Cisco took notice when Arista's senior executives began publicly  
 26 boasting about their copying of Cisco's CLI. For years, Cisco had competed—successfully—  
 27 against other networking companies, such as Juniper, who developed their own operating systems  
 28 and their own user interfaces. Arista's public acknowledgements that it was intentionally using

1 Cisco's CLI to compete against Cisco were unique. It also indicated willful copyright and patent  
 2 infringement.

3 Cisco therefore filed this suit, alleging that Arista has infringed 26 copyrighted works and  
 4 2 patents, on December 5, 2014. *See* Dkt. 1. Cisco's complaint identified many aspects of its  
 5 copyrighted works that Arista had misappropriated, including more than 500 multi-word  
 6 command expressions, the hierarchical arrangement of those commands, command modes and  
 7 prompts, command outputs, and the supporting documentation—which Arista had copied right  
 8 down to the typos. *See id.* ¶¶ 9, 50-57.

9 Prior to and throughout this litigation, Arista has repeatedly admitted its copying. For  
 10 example, Arista admitted that it used the Cisco CLI command expressions identified in Cisco's  
 11 complaint. *See* Dkt. 36 ¶ 53 ("Arista admits that it uses the IOS command expressions included in  
 12 Exhibit 1 to Cisco's complaint."). It also admitted that Arista "uses the command modes and  
 13 prompts identified under the subheading 'Arista EOS Command Modes.'" *See id.* ¶ 54. In a  
 14 public statement the weekend after Cisco's complaint was filed, Arista's CEO admitted that the  
 15 company had copied at least portions of Cisco's product documentation. *See* Ex. 8 at CSI-CLI-  
 16 00357849. And, in an ITC case that went to trial just a few weeks ago, Arista's lawyers  
 17 proclaimed in open court that Arista "emulates Cisco's command-line interface." *See* Ex. 2 at  
 18 54:25-55:2.

19 **D. Arista's One-Sided Approach to Discovery in this Case**

20 Given Arista's public admissions regarding its use of Cisco's CLI, this case should be  
 21 relatively straightforward. But Arista's tune has since changed, in that Arista now wishes to deny  
 22 using any of the Cisco command expressions that it previously admitted using, while at the same  
 23 time still admitting that it uses many of the same commands as Cisco. *See, e.g.*, Ex. 9 at 23-24  
 24 (stating that "[s]ome of the commands [in Arista's EOS] are also used by Cisco," yet claiming that  
 25 "none of the [Arista] CLI commands accused by Cisco of copyright infringement in this lawsuit is  
 26 identical to a command in Cisco IOS CLI"). Arista has further sought to complicate the case by  
 27 serving onerous and irrelevant discovery requests on Cisco while largely refusing to respond  
 28 substantively to Cisco's requests.

1       One example of Arista’s lopsided tactics can be seen in the parties’ respective answers to  
 2 interrogatories regarding copyright infringement and non-infringement. Arista served its  
 3 Interrogatory No. 2 on April 10, 2015. That interrogatory seeks an identification of the elements  
 4 from Cisco’s copyrighted works that Arista has infringed. Cisco has responded by producing  
 5 extensive documentation of Arista’s copying, including eight pages of narrative explanation and  
 6 citations to supporting documents, as well as 354 pages of supporting charts containing more  
 7 specific details. *See* Cannon Decl. ¶ 11. By contrast, Arista’s first “substantive” response to  
 8 Cisco’s non-infringement interrogatory—Interrogatory No. 10—includes no specifics. *See* Ex. 9  
 9 at 29-31. Arista’s interrogatory response merely suggests that certain elements of Cisco’s  
 10 copyrighted works are not original, such that Arista’s copying of those elements does not evidence  
 11 Arista’s copyright infringement—similar to the suggestions in Arista’s Motion to Compel. But  
 12 Arista’s interrogatory response—like its Motion to Compel—does not identify a single pre-  
 13 existing work that contains any aspect of Cisco’s copyrighted CLI, or otherwise provide any  
 14 factual support for its assertion that Cisco’s CLI is not original to Cisco. *See id.* In part, Arista’s  
 15 non-response to Cisco’s interrogatory is based on Arista’s objection that, with more than 500  
 16 copied elements at issue, Arista needs additional time (beyond the nine months this case has been  
 17 pending) to study each such copied element. *See id.* at, e.g., 29 (“If Cisco insists on accusing over  
 18 500 different CLI commands in this litigation, it must provide a reasonable amount of time for  
 19 Arista to investigate and provide responses to discovery relating to those hundreds of  
 20 commands.”). Cisco cannot help but observe that Arista’s demand for additional time to respond  
 21 to Cisco’s interrogatories—because locating and verifying data across hundreds of individual  
 22 commands takes time—makes Arista’s instant motion to compel (on shortened time, after Cisco  
 23 agreed to supplement) hypocritical.

24       The interrogatories related to each party’s respective product development—including the  
 25 interrogatories on which Arista has moved to compel—have been handled similarly  
 26 asymmetrically. Cisco served interrogatories asking Arista about the development of its accused  
 27 products on March 26, 2015. *See* Cannon Decl. ¶ 12. Arista objected on burden and relevance  
 28 grounds and provided no substantive response to those interrogatories until a week ago

1 (September 18, 2015), and even that supplemental response, served six months after receiving  
 2 Cisco's interrogatory, included a mere three paragraphs that identified no documents and only a  
 3 dozen individuals. *See* Ex. 9 at 24-26. Cisco is continuing to work with Arista to obtain  
 4 responsive information without involving the Court, although seeking judicial intervention may  
 5 soon be necessary if Arista does not begin substantively participating in discovery. (Unlike  
 6 Arista, Cisco does not intend to file a motion to compel unless and until the meet-and-confer  
 7 process has been given a reasonable opportunity to succeed.)

8       **E. Arista's Failure to Meet and Confer**

9       Arista did not properly meet and confer before filing this motion. Arista engaged in  
 10 meaningful discussion of only one of the two disputed interrogatories (No. 5). On the other (No.  
 11 16)—which is the only interrogatory that actually calls for the information Arista appears to be  
 12 seeking by its motion—Arista never attempted to confer in good faith.

13       Arista's Interrogatory No. 5, served on April 10, 2015, sought information regarding the  
 14 "derivation" of every Cisco IOS CLI command expression. *See* Dkt. 67 at Exhibit E. Cisco  
 15 responded that it was not aware of any responsive information because all of the command  
 16 expressions in Cisco's copyrighted works were developed by Cisco. *See* 67 at Exhibit F, p. 14.  
 17 Cisco had not derived its CLI from others. In the meet-and-confer process, Arista later tried to  
 18 correct its request by explaining that it instead sought information not about "derivation" of  
 19 commands, but actually about their *creation*. Cisco maintained its burden objections,<sup>2</sup> but  
 20 nevertheless (to avoid a discovery dispute) provided a narrative response that described in detail  
 21 the process by which CLI commands have been created at Cisco, and identified documents that  
 22 further explained Cisco's internal creative process. *See id.* at pp. 14-15. For example, Cisco  
 23 identified various versions of a document known as the "Parser Police Manifesto," which  
 24 explained guidelines Cisco sought to apply to creation of CLI command expressions to ensure

---

26       <sup>2</sup> Cisco objected that this interrogatory was overly broad, in that it sought information  
 27 regarding portions of Cisco's copyrighted works not at issue. *See* Dkt. 67 at Exhibit F, pp. 13-14.  
 28 Cisco also objected that this interrogatory was unduly burdensome to the extent that it purported to  
 require fine-grained analysis of every individual command expression in Cisco's IOS. *See id.*

1 those command expressions fit within Cisco’s original command hierarchies. *See* Cannon Decl.  
 2 ¶ 13.

3 In response to further demands from Arista, Cisco supplemented again to identify a person  
 4 most knowledgeable about the development of Cisco’s CLI—Kirk Lougheed, a distinguished  
 5 Cisco Engineering Fellow who was principally responsible for creating Cisco’s first CLI,  
 6 including many command expressions and the arrangement thereof. *See id.* at p. 15.

7 Between the dates of Cisco’s two supplemental responses to Arista’s Interrogatory No. 5,  
 8 Arista served Interrogatory No. 16. *See* Dkt. 67 at Exhibit H. That interrogatory seeks five  
 9 categories of information regarding each of the individual elements of Cisco’s copyrighted works  
 10 that Cisco has alleged Arista copied, including more than 500 multi-word command expressions.  
 11 *See id.* at p. 4. This requested information includes the “author or originator” of each individual  
 12 command expression, the date on which the individual command expression was created, the  
 13 document in which it was first “fixed,” the document in which the individual command expression  
 14 was first published, and the first product(s) that responded to each command expression. *See id.*

15 In its response to Arista’s request for thousands of individual pieces of information, Cisco  
 16 timely objected (on August 27, 2015) that Interrogatory No. 16 is compound and unduly  
 17 burdensome. *See* Dkt. 67 at Exhibit I, p. 6. Cisco also objected that it sought information that is  
 18 not relevant to the copyrightability of Cisco’s asserted works. *See id.* Reserving its objections,  
 19 Cisco responded substantively. Cisco specifically incorporated its recent supplemental responses  
 20 to Interrogatory No. 5, which (as described above) included: identifying documents that contained  
 21 responsive information (such as the first product to include many of the copied command  
 22 expressions);<sup>3</sup> a narrative explanation of the development of Cisco’s copyrighted works; and  
 23 identifying an individual most knowledgeable about the process by which many of Cisco’s

---

24  
 25       <sup>3</sup> Cisco’s product manuals, which are among the documents that Cisco cited pursuant to Rule  
 26 33(d), often include a “command history” field, which identifies the first version of Cisco’s  
 27 copyrighted operating system to include a given command expression. *See, e.g.*, Ex. 10 at CSI-  
 28 CLI-00293157 (“default-information originate (OSPFv3”), CSI-CLI-00293515-17 (“ipv6 nd  
 prefix”), CSI-CLI-00293558-59 (“ipv6 neighbor”). Many of these fields often include additional  
 information regarding subsequent use of a command. *See, e.g., id.*

1 command expressions, command hierarchies, command modes and prompts, and command  
 2 outputs were created—including information about the teams of Cisco engineers involved in  
 3 creating them.<sup>4</sup> *See* Dkt. 67 at Exhibit F, pp. 13-15. In addition, Cisco identified further  
 4 documents that included the date on which each copyrighted work-in-suit was completed and the  
 5 legal author of each such work (Cisco). *See id.*<sup>5</sup>

6       A week after Cisco served its initial response to Interrogatory No. 16, Arista sent  
 7 correspondence regarding that response. *See* Ex. 11. Rather than proposing that the parties  
 8 discuss how to balance the burdens presented by that interrogatory with Arista’s purported need  
 9 for additional information, Arista proposed that the parties discuss a motion to compel on a  
 10 shortened briefing schedule. *See id.* at 2. When the parties conferred by phone on September 15,  
 11 Arista maintained its inflexible posture. Arista’s counsel indicated that Arista was not interested  
 12 in discussing the burdens of these requests or ways to try to mitigate those burdens, or about any  
 13 supplementation short of providing every bit of information requested within days. *See* Cannon  
 14 Decl. at ¶ 16; *see also* Ex. 12. Arista would not clarify why its need for the many fine-grained  
 15 categories of information called for by its interrogatory was so urgent either. *See id.* Cisco’s  
 16 counsel explained that Arista was acting precipitously and tried to have a conversation about the  
 17 disproportionate burden of the request. *See id.* Cisco stated nonetheless that it would work to  
 18 further supplement its earlier responses by October 2 (if not sooner) with much of the requested  
 19 information that it had been in the process of gathering, and that it would clarify the details of such  
 20 a supplementation by the end of the week following additional investigation. *See id.* In response,  
 21 Arista confirmed its intent to file its motion to compel regardless what the parties discussed, by  
 22 filing its motion on Thursday of that week, before Cisco could confirm the details of its proposed  
 23 supplementation.

24  
 25       <sup>4</sup> Mr. Lougheed was responsible for developing the earliest version of Cisco’s CLI. He also  
 26 created or directed the teams who created of many of Cisco’s command expressions and their  
 27 organization and is knowledgeable about the process by which many others were created.  
 28       <sup>5</sup> This information is contained in Cisco’s copyright registration applications and certificates,  
 which Cisco identified pursuant to Rule 33(d) in its response to Interrogatory No. 16.

1        After Arista filed its motion to compel and motion to shorten time, Cisco explained its  
 2 proposed supplementation and its objections to providing additional, incremental information in  
 3 correspondence dated September 21, 2015, in an effort to try to resolve the dispute. *See* Ex. 12.  
 4 Cisco explained that it would provide the information now contained in its supplemental response  
 5 to Interrogatory No. 16, including the work in which each command expression first appeared, the  
 6 date on which that work was completed and/or distributed, and the products that supported those  
 7 works. *See id.* In a response the next day, Arista confirmed that it remained unwilling to  
 8 negotiate, and would maintain its motion in the absence of a commitment by Cisco to provide  
 9 everything Arista was seeking, without evidencing any interest in hearing Cisco's positions on  
 10 burden and the marginal relevance of the information that remained at issue. *See* Ex. 13.

11        **F. Cisco's Supplemental Response to Interrogatory No. 16**

12        Concurrently with the filing of this brief, Cisco is serving Arista with a supplemental  
 13 response to Interrogatory No. 16. *See* Ex. 1. This information contains the information that Cisco  
 14 promised in its September 21 letter, and then some. Specifically, Cisco has identified the work in  
 15 which each command expression first appeared, the date on which that work was completed  
 16 and/or distributed, and the Cisco products that supported those works. Cisco has also identified  
 17 specific commands about which Cisco Fellow Kirk Lougheed can provide further information, and  
 18 another senior Cisco engineer who can testify about Cisco's creative process. Cisco's  
 19 supplemental response to Arista's interrogatory spans nineteen pages.

20        **III. LEGAL STANDARD**

21        The party seeking discovery bears the burden of proving that the information sought is  
 22 relevant. *See Louisiana Pac. Corp. v. Money Mkt. I Institutional Inv. Dealer*, No. 3:09-cv-03529-  
 23 JSW-LB, 2012 WL 5519199, at \*3 (N.D. Cal. Nov. 14, 2012). For purposes of discovery,  
 24 relevance is construed broadly, encompassing information that is reasonably calculated to lead to  
 25 the discovery of admissible evidence. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(b). A reasonableness requirement is  
 26 thus built into the discovery rules.

27        In the modern era of electronically stored information, "reasonableness" includes ensuring  
 28 that the burden imposed by discovery requests is proportional to the expected benefit of such

1 requests. *See, e.g.*, Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(b)(2)(B). Where information is only marginally likely to be  
 2 relevant, but significantly burdensome to obtain, it is not discoverable. *See, e.g.*, Fed. R. Civ. P.  
 3 26(b)(2)(C)(iii) (stating that a court “must limit the frequency or extent of discovery” where “the  
 4 burden or expense of proposed discovery outweighs its likely benefit, considering the needs of the  
 5 case, the amount in controversy, the parties’ resources, the importance of the issues at stake in the  
 6 action, and the importance of the discovery in resolving the issues”).

7       In the event of a discovery dispute, parties are required to meet and confer “in good faith”  
 8 to resolve their discovery dispute without action by the Court. Fed. R. Civ. P. 37(a)(1); *see also*  
 9 Civil L.R. 37-1(a). Failure to meet and confer as required risks needlessly squandering scarce  
 10 judicial resources, and is therefore a sufficient basis for denying a motion to compel. *See, e.g.*, *In*  
 11 *re First Franklin Financial Corp. Lit.*, No. C08-01515JW (HRL), 2010 WL 961649, at \*1 (N.D.  
 12 Cal. Mar. 16, 2010) (finding failure to meet and confer “sufficient grounds to deny [a] motion to  
 13 compel”).

14 **IV. ARGUMENT**

15       The live issues on Arista’s motion to compel are far narrower than Arista claims. There is  
 16 no dispute regarding “basic” information, or information that is merely “bibliographic.” Cisco has  
 17 already provided, or has agreed to search for and produce, the “basic” information regarding its  
 18 copyrighted works and their constituent elements. *See* Section IV.A, *infra*. The remaining  
 19 incremental information about individual elements of Cisco’s copyrighted works that Cisco has  
 20 not yet provided is, at best, marginally relevant and incredibly burdensome to obtain. Arista’s  
 21 motion to compel therefore fails substantively, although it should also be denied on procedural  
 22 grounds due to Arista’s failure to meet and confer in good faith before filing it.

23       A. **Cisco Has Already Produced Extensive Information About Its Copyrighted**  
 24 **CLI**

25       Reading Arista’s brief, it would be easy to get the mistaken impression that Cisco has not  
 26 provided much information regarding the development of its copyrighted works. Not so. In fact,  
 27 Cisco has provided virtually all the information that Arista purports to seek.

1 Arista's Interrogatory No. 5, to which Arista hopes to bootstrap all of the information  
 2 sought in its Motion to Compel, was specifically worded to seek information regarding the  
 3 "derivation" of Cisco's CLI command expressions (*i.e.*, the development of those command  
 4 expressions from another source). The obvious implication from that phrasing was that Cisco  
 5 somehow took its CLI command expressions from others' works. Cisco responded that its  
 6 command expressions—like the rest of Cisco's CLI—were Cisco creations, and that it was not  
 7 aware of any responsive information. *See* Dkt. 67 at Exhibit F, p. 14. Nevertheless, once Arista  
 8 mutated its request for information about "derivation" into a request for information about the  
 9 original creation of Cisco's copyrighted works, Cisco provided a narrative response that identified  
 10 documents about Cisco's creative process. *See id.* at pp. 14-15. Cisco then further supplemented  
 11 to identify a person most knowledgeable about that process—someone that had been personally  
 12 responsible for the development of dozens of Cisco's command expressions, as well as the  
 13 arrangement thereof and other aspects of Cisco's copyrighted works-in-suit. *See id.* at p. 15.

14 Arista's Interrogatory No. 16 calls for five significantly more burdensome categories of  
 15 information than its Interrogatory No. 5—categories for which it seeks information regarding each  
 16 of the hundreds of individual elements that Arista unlawfully copied.<sup>6</sup> Notwithstanding Cisco's  
 17 objections to the burdensome nature of this interrogatory, Cisco has provided the information  
 18 about the origin of its copyrighted works and their constituent elements, which is most of the  
 19 information that is reasonably available to Cisco, and which represents the vast majority of the  
 20 information sought by Arista.<sup>7</sup>

21 **Author:** In its initial response to Interrogatory No. 16, Cisco identified documents  
 22 showing that Cisco is the owner of the copyrighted works-in-suit, including their constituent  
 23 elements. *See* Dkt. 67 at Exhibit I, pp. 6-11 (identifying pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 33(d), *inter*

---

24  
 25 <sup>6</sup> Arista has not identified any incremental information sought by its Interrogatory No. 5, so  
 this discussion will focus on Interrogatory No. 16.

26 <sup>7</sup> Cisco is investigating whether additional documents that corroborate this information are  
 27 available. To the extent such documents exist and can be located through reasonable efforts,  
 Cisco will produce such documents and amend its response to Interrogatory Nos. 5 and 16 to  
 28 identify them for Arista.

1 *alia*, Cisco’s copyright registration certificates). Cisco is also a legal author of the works-in-suit,  
 2 given that the creative endeavors of Cisco employees constitute Cisco’s “works made for hire.”<sup>8</sup>  
 3 See 17 U.S.C. § 201(b) (“In the case of a work made for hire, the employer or other person for  
 4 whom the work was prepared is considered the author for purposes of this title. . .”). Contrary to  
 5 Arista’s implications, no individual member of Cisco’s engineering teams who created the works-  
 6 in-suit is a legal “author” of those works. See *16 Casa Duse, LLC v. Merkin*, 791 F.3d 247, 257  
 7 (2d Cir. 2015) (holding that “non-freestanding contributions to works of authorship are not  
 8 ordinarily themselves works of authorship”); *Amer. Dental Assoc. v. Delta Dental Plans Assoc.*,  
 9 126 F.3d 977, 978-79 (7th Cir. 1997) (reversing the district court finding that “as the work of a  
 10 committee, the Code could not be thought original. Creation by committee is an oxymoron” and  
 11 holding instead that “most commercial software these days is written by committee . . . these items  
 12 are routinely copyrighted, and challenges to the validity of these copyrights are routinely  
 13 rejected”). In addition, Cisco has identified persons knowledgeable about the process by which  
 14 the command expressions and other elements of its copyrighted works were created, including the  
 15 individual responsible for the early development of Cisco’s CLI, senior engineer and Cisco Fellow  
 16 Kirk Lougheed. See Dkt. 67 at Exhibit F, p. 15. And in its supplemental response to Interrogatory  
 17 No. 16, Cisco has identified an additional senior engineer who is knowledgeable regarding  
 18 specific command expressions from its copyrighted works and the process by which those  
 19 elements were created. See Ex. 1 at 12. Cisco is investigating whether it can identify additional  
 20 individuals knowledgeable about these command expressions and will further supplement its  
 21 response if such individuals are discovered.

22 **Date of Completion:** Cisco provided information regarding the date its copyrighted  
 23 works-in-suit were completed along with its complaint. That information is stated on the face of  
 24

---

25       <sup>8</sup> For this reason, the names of individual contributors to Cisco’s copyrighted works would  
 26 not be the sort of “bibliographic” information that would be included in a copyright application—  
 27 contrary to implications by Arista. See, e.g., Ex. 13 at 2 (commenting on “the fact that Cisco  
 28 apparently has not identified in its copyright registration the ‘teams of Cisco employees’ who  
 purportedly created the protectable expression”).

1 Cisco's copyright registration certificates. *See, e.g.*, Dkt. 64 at Exhibits 3-28. In its supplemental  
 2 response to Interrogatory No. 16, Cisco also identified the dates on which each command  
 3 expression was first introduced in any of Cisco's works. *See* Ex. 1 at 12-25.

4       **First Publication:** In its original response to Interrogatory No. 16, Cisco identified  
 5 documents from which Arista could identify the first version of Cisco's copyrighted operating  
 6 systems in which most of the copied command expressions were initially used. *See, e.g.*, Dkt. 67  
 7 at Exhibit I, p. 8 (citing, *inter alia*, the Cisco IOS IPv6 Command Reference, which contains the  
 8 "Command History" for the multi-word command expressions "ipv6 neighbor," "default-metric  
 9 (OSPFv3)," "ipv6 nd prefix," "default-information originate (OSPFv3)," "log-adjacency-changes  
 10 (OSPFv3)," "maximum-paths (OSPFv3)," "passive-interface (OSPFv3)," and "router-id  
 11 (OSPFv3)"). In its supplemental response, Cisco has consulted those documents, as well as some  
 12 additional documents being produced imminently, and gathered the requested information in  
 13 tabular form. *See* Ex. 1 at 12-25. That supplemental response includes data on the first version of  
 14 Cisco's operating system to contain each of the more than 500 command expressions copied by  
 15 Arista. *See id.*

16       **First Product:** Cisco's supplemental response to Interrogatory No. 16 also identifies  
 17 hardware products that supported the various operating systems in which the command  
 18 expressions copied by Arista were first introduced by Cisco. *See id.* Cisco is also preparing  
 19 corroborating documents for production.

20       The parties' remaining discovery dispute, to the extent one remains, concerns only a small  
 21 fraction of the information that Arista described in its motion—not the full scope of its  
 22 Interrogatory No. 16. The only live issue presented by Arista's motion, then, is whether Cisco  
 23 should be compelled to produce the rest of what Arista is seeking.

24       **B.       The Remaining Incremental Information Arista Seeks Is Not Relevant**

25       Cisco has already provided Arista with far more than "basic" information regarding its  
 26 copyrighted works and the elements thereof. The only information Arista seeks that Cisco has not  
 27 provided or agreed to provide are the details of the work done by every single person Cisco hired  
 28 to create the command expressions that Arista copied. Arista must prove that the relevance of this

1 information outweighs the undue burden of collecting it to succeed on its motion to compel. But  
 2 Arista's scant discussion of relevance in its Motion to Compel spans less than two pages. (Mot. at  
 3 9-10.) The bulk of that argument is devoted to a high-level recitation of principles of copyright  
 4 law, rather than an explanation of why the fine-grained details about the constituent elements of  
 5 Cisco's copyrighted works—elements that Arista consciously chose to copy from Cisco—would  
 6 be relevant. Arista simply asserts that these details are relevant to the originality of Cisco's works,  
 7 the merger or *scenes a faire* doctrines, or Arista's fair use defense. But because the fine-grained  
 8 details that remain are not material to those issues, Arista's motion should be denied.

9 Arista's explanation for why these details are relevant to originality makes little sense.  
 10 Cisco's burden to prove originality is easily carried. *See, e.g., Feist Publications, Inc. v. Rural*  
*11 Telephone Service Co.*, 499 U.S. 340, 345 (1991) ("To be sure, the requisite level of creativity is  
 12 extremely low; even a slight amount will suffice."). The originality of the works-in-suit will in  
 13 fact be presumed on the basis of Cisco's copyright registration certificates. *See* 17 U.S.C.  
 14 § 410(c). Yet Arista claims that it needs the identity of each individual who worked on  
 15 implementing the copied elements from Cisco's copyrighted works so that it can test the  
 16 originality of those elements by deposing every such person. (*See* Mot. at 10.) But Arista does  
 17 not identify what information it would hope to gain from multiple depositions of former and  
 18 current Cisco employees who created Cisco's CLI as works made for hire for Cisco over the past  
 19 30 years that would be legally relevant and that it could not gain from Cisco's discovery responses  
 20 and/or information that is publicly available. In fact, Arista admits that its challenges to the  
 21 originality of certain elements of Cisco's copyrighted works, which it has not yet identified in  
 22 discovery, are based instead on publicly-available documents concerning standards. (*See* Mot. at 5  
 23 ("In truth, many of the commands Cisco claims as exclusively its own derive from fundamental  
 24 industry standard **documents**.")) (emphasis added).) Because Arista has not identified any  
 25 incremental information relevant to originality that it hopes to gain from such depositions, it has  
 26 failed to justify the relevance of this request in light of the heavy burden it imposes.

27 Further, Arista's assertions that one or more of the command expressions from Cisco's  
 28 copyrighted works are not original are also insufficient to defeat Cisco's claims of copyright

1 infringement in any event, making this burdensome exercise more unnecessary. It is black-letter  
 2 law that the selection and arrangement of even *unoriginal* elements is protectable. *See, e.g.*,  
 3 *Brocade Communications Sys., Inc. v. A10 Networks, Inc.*, No. C 10-3428 PSG, 2013 WL 831528,  
 4 at \*5 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 10, 2013) (“Copyright can and does protect creative expression even of  
 5 features that are themselves unprotectable.”); *Secureinfo Corp. v. Telos Corp.*, 387 F. Supp. 2d  
 6 593, 611 (E.D. Va. Sep. 9, 2005) (“Nonliteral elements of a computer program may receive  
 7 copyright protection even if they are individually unprotectable, if they are compiled in a unique  
 8 or creative way.”). Each of these command expressions will remain at issue in the case, regardless  
 9 of whatever details about them Arista’s burdensome interrogatory could elicit.

10 Arista also fails to explain how the identity of every person who worked on each of  
 11 Cisco’s command expressions would lead to relevant information regarding the merger or *scènes à  
 12 faire* doctrines, or to Arista’s fair use defense. (*See* Mot. at 10-11.) Arista’s contention that those  
 13 doctrines limit Arista’s liability in this case are baseless. Cisco’s documents and witnesses,  
 14 including Mr. Lougheed, will confirm that Cisco had choices about the expressions it created and  
 15 the manner in which they were arranged. *See, e.g.*, Dkt. 67 at Exhibit F, p. 15 (identifying  
 16 evidence regarding Cisco’s creative process). So, too, will Arista’s documents, which implicitly  
 17 reflect the existence of alternatives to Cisco’s command expressions in Arista’s internal debates  
 18 about how “slavishly” it should copy Cisco’s creative works. *See* Ex. 5. With respect to Arista’s  
 19 ill-conceived fair use defense, the nature of Cisco’s copyrighted works and the importance of the  
 20 copyrighted elements to them similarly will be evident from the works themselves. Arista does  
 21 not explain what relevant, incremental information it hopes to gain from burdensome depositions  
 22 of every engineer who worked on every element of Cisco’s copyrighted works that Arista  
 23 deliberately copied, as is its burden in moving to compel.

24 Arista has not explained why the remaining incremental data that Cisco has not produced  
 25 (or agreed to search for) in response to Interrogatory No. 16 are relevant to the real issue in this  
 26 case: Arista’s intentional, wholesale copying of Cisco’s copyrighted CLI. Relative to the  
 27 extensive information that Cisco has already provided about its copyrighted works, the details  
 28 about every single person who worked on creating a given command expression is at most

1 marginally relevant to non-dispositive issues. Production of such tangential details should not be  
 2 compelled, given the burden of identifying them.

3 **C. The Burden of Obtaining this Incremental Information Would Be**  
 4 **Disproportionate to Its Relevance**

5 When evaluating the proportionality of Arista’s request, it is important to evaluate not the  
 6 request as a whole—because Cisco has produced or has agreed to produce the bulk of the  
 7 information sought. *See Section A, supra.* Instead, the question is whether the burden in  
 8 obtaining the additional details Cisco has thus far been unable to provide outweighs the relevance  
 9 of those specific details. The burden of obtaining the specific details Arista is seeking is  
 10 significantly disproportionate to their minimal relevance.

11 The burden of obtaining additional details beyond the information that Cisco has already  
 12 provided would be extreme. The information that Arista is seeking—the identity of every  
 13 individual who worked on each command expression copied by Arista—is not information Cisco  
 14 keeps in the ordinary course of business or details that are required by the Copyright Office. The  
 15 command expressions at issue in this case were developed over decades—some date back to the  
 16 mid-1980s. In that time, Cisco’s copyrighted operating systems have grown to encompass  
 17 millions of lines of code. To unearth details of work done thirty years ago would require  
 18 extraordinary efforts.

19 The Declaration of Phillip Remaker (“Remaker Decl.”) explains the difficulty in  
 20 attempting to identify the additional details about Cisco’s command expressions sought by Arista.  
 21 To search for detailed information regarding the individual employees who created a particular  
 22 command expression requires searching through multiple discrete document management systems.  
 23 *See Remaker Decl. at ¶ 3.* The search tools available for use with these systems are not well-  
 24 adapted to looking for details regarding individual command expressions. *See id. at ¶¶ 4-6, 8.*  
 25 Even if a document mentioning a given command expression can be located, it may not be  
 26 possible to determine if that document is the earliest document in which that command expression  
 27 appeared. *See id. at ¶ 7.* A search across Cisco’s various source code repositories is likely to be  
 28 similarly difficult. *See id. at ¶¶ 9-11.* Mr. Remaker’s experience in attempting to locate

1 individuals who worked on several exemplary command expressions confirms the difficulties  
 2 attendant to this process. *See id.* at ¶¶ 18-21.

3 Arista cannot reasonably dispute the burden that providing this level of detail would  
 4 require. Despite being both smaller than Cisco and having a much shorter history, Arista has  
 5 objected to providing the development history of its accused products on the ground that doing so  
 6 would be unduly burdensome. *See, e.g.*, Ex. 9 at 24-26. Arista has similarly objected that  
 7 providing its contentions regarding any specific elements from Cisco's copyrighted works will  
 8 require additional time—beyond the six months that Cisco's interrogatories have been pending—  
 9 because of the volume of such information. *See id.* at, *e.g.*, 29 (“If Cisco insists on accusing over  
 10 500 different CLI commands in this litigation, it must provide a reasonable amount of time for  
 11 Arista to investigate and provide responses to discovery relating to those hundreds of  
 12 commands.”). Arista should not be permitted to impose burdens on Cisco that it is unwilling to  
 13 undertake itself.

14 No modern technology company who hoped to defend its copyrights in computer products  
 15 could reasonably do so under the discovery standards that Arista proposes. By insisting that it is  
 16 entitled to information about—and a deposition of—not just the legal author of Cisco's  
 17 copyrighted works, but also every individual who could be described as an “originator” of any  
 18 element from those works that Arista chooses to copy, Arista sets an unreasonably burdensome  
 19 standard. In any copyright infringement case involving software, the plaintiff would be required  
 20 to identify and produce for deposition nearly every single employee responsible for developing the  
 21 literal or non-literal aspects of its works that are alleged to be copied—every programmer,  
 22 engineer, program manager, or other employee involved with the development of that application.  
 23 Such an unreasonable undertaking cannot be the standard for discovery in copyright cases. Nor  
 24 can Arista reasonably contend otherwise, in light of its refusal to provide such detailed  
 25 information regarding the development of its own accused products. *See id.* at 24-26.

26 Given the marginal relevance of the incremental details Arista is seeking, the burden  
 27 required to provide that information far outweighs its potential value. This disproportionality  
 28 justifies denying Arista's Motion to Compel.

1                   **D.        Arista's Motion to Compel Is Procedurally Improper**

2                   Both Fed. R. Civ. P. 37(a)(1) and Civil Local Rule 37-1(a) require counsel to confer to  
 3 engage in a good-faith effort to resolve discovery disputes without judicial intervention. The  
 4 reason for this is clear: It preserves scarce judicial resources for disputes that really matter.  
 5 Arista's Motion to Compel does not raise such a dispute—in significant part because Arista failed  
 6 to meet and confer regarding Interrogatory No. 16.

7                   Although Arista purports to base its motion on both Interrogatory No. 5 and Interrogatory  
 8 No. 16, as described above, Interrogatory No. 5 does not call for much of the information that  
 9 Arista is seeking to compel. The fact that Arista even served Interrogatory No. 16 instead of  
 10 simply moving to compel on Interrogatory No. 5 confirms this to be true. The parties' real  
 11 dispute, to the extent there is any real dispute remaining after Cisco's supplementation, concerns  
 12 Interrogatory No. 16.

13                   Arista never conferred regarding Cisco's response to Interrogatory No. 16 in good faith.  
 14 Cisco served its response to Interrogatory No. 16 on August 27, 2015. Arista sent a letter  
 15 complaining about that response one week later on September 3, 2015. *See* Ex. 11. In that  
 16 letter—before the parties had even scheduled a time to talk about Interrogatory No. 16—Arista  
 17 already demanded that Cisco agree to a shortened briefing schedule on a motion to compel. *See*  
 18 *id.* at 2. When the parties did actually confer on September 15, Arista's counsel indicated that it  
 19 was "not interested" in hearing about the burdens the requests imposed on Cisco and exploring  
 20 ways to reduce those burdens. *See* Cannon Decl. at ¶ 16. Nor was Arista interested in hearing  
 21 about what information Cisco could provide by way of supplementation, or when it could provide  
 22 that information. *See id.* Instead, unless Cisco agreed to provide every scrap of information  
 23 Arista was seeking within days of the parties' telephonic conference, Arista stated that it was  
 24 going to move to compel on an expedited schedule. *See id.* Cisco's counsel stated that it would  
 25 provide an explanation of what it could provide by way of supplementation—notwithstanding its  
 26 objections—by the end of that week. *See id.* But Arista filed its motion to compel on Thursday in  
 27  
 28

1 a transparent attempt to avoid considering any information from Cisco responsive to the purported  
 2 “meet and confer.”<sup>9</sup> Arista then moved to shorten time the next day.

3       Had Arista met and conferred with Cisco in good faith, this dispute could have been  
 4 avoided—or at least significantly narrowed. As described above, Cisco had already provided  
 5 Arista with most of the information it was requesting, and based on the discussion with Arista was  
 6 diligently collecting additional information to include in a supplemental response. Cisco provided  
 7 that information, which Arista had pre-judged as insufficient, but actually provides most of the  
 8 remaining information Arista is seeking that is arguably relevant, today. *See* Ex. 1. To the extent  
 9 any dispute remains, Arista’s haste prevented the parties from discussing reasonable compromises,  
 10 such as an agreement by Cisco to prioritize gathering information about elements from Cisco’s  
 11 copyrighted works regarding which Arista could identify a tenable challenge to originality or  
 12 protectability.

13       Arista’s failure to meet and confer would suffice to justify denying Arista’s motion to  
 14 compel in any case. *See, e.g., In re First Franklin Financial Corp. Lit.*, 2010 WL 961649, at \*1.  
 15 Such a result is even more appropriate here, where Arista’s refusal to negotiate in good faith has  
 16 forced the Court and the parties to expend significant resources on this motion unnecessarily.

17 **V. CONCLUSION**

18       Accordingly, Cisco respectfully requests that the Court deny Arista’s Motion to Compel in  
 19 its entirety or, at a minimum, grant Cisco a reasonable time to respond to Arista’s Interrogatories.

20  
 21  
 22  
 23  
 24  
 25  
 26       <sup>9</sup> Cisco ultimately sent its responsive correspondence on Monday, September 21, 2015, so  
 27 that it could take Arista’s motions into account. *See* Ex. 12. Arista’s response the next day  
 28 confirmed Arista’s unwillingness to even consider compromise. *See* Ex. 13.

1  
2 DATED: September 28, 2015

Respectfully submitted,

3 /s/ John M. Neukom  
4

5 Kathleen Sullivan (SBN 242261)  
6 kathleensullivan@quinnmanuel.com  
7 QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART &  
8 SULLIVAN LLP  
9 51 Madison Avenue, 22<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
10 New York, NY 10010  
11 Telephone: (212) 849-7000  
12 Facsimile: (212) 849-7100

13 Sean S. Pak (SBN 219032)  
14 seanpak@quinnmanuel.com  
15 John M. Neukom (SBN 275887)  
16 johnneukom@quinnmanuel.com.  
17 Matthew D. Cannon (SBN 252666)  
18 matthewcannon@quinnmanuel.com  
19 QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART &  
20 SULLIVAN LLP  
21 50 California Street, 22<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
22 San Francisco, CA 94111  
23 Telephone: (415) 875-6600  
24 Facsimile: (415) 875-6700

25 Mark Tung (SBN 245782)  
26 marktung@quinnmanuel.com  
27 QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART &  
28 SULLIVAN LLP  
29 555 Twin Dolphin Drive, 5<sup>th</sup> Floor  
30 Redwood Shores, CA 94065  
31 Telephone: (650) 801-5000  
32 Facsimile: (650) 801-5100

33 Steven Cherny (*admission pro hac vice*  
34 *pending*)  
35 steven.cherny@kirkland.com  
36 KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP  
37 601 Lexington Avenue  
38 New York, New York 10022  
39 Telephone: (212) 446-4800  
40 Facsimile: (212) 446-4900

41 Adam R. Alper (SBN 196834)  
42 adam.alper@kirkland.com  
43 KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP  
44 555 California Street  
45 San Francisco, California 94104  
46 Telephone: (415) 439-1400  
47 Facsimile: (415) 439-1500

1 Michael W. De Vries (SBN 211001)  
2 michael.devries@kirkland.com  
3 KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP  
4 333 South Hope Street  
5 Los Angeles, California 90071  
6 Telephone: (213) 680-8400  
7 Facsimile: (213) 680-8500

8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

22  
OPPOSITION TO MOTION TO DISMISS  
Case No.3:14-cv-05344-BLF